

BUCHALTER

A Professional Corporation
J. Rick Taché (SBN: 195100)
Kari L. Barnes (SBN: 253640)
Roger L. Scott (SBN: 247165)
18400 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 800
Irvine, CA 92612-0514
Telephone: 949.760.1121
Facsimile: 949.720.0182
E-mail: rtaché@buchalter.com
kbarnes@buchalter.com
rscott@buchalter.com

Attorneys for Defendants,
AMP Plus, Inc. doing business as
ELCO Lighting and ELCO Lighting, Inc.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

DMF, INC. a California Corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMP PLUS, INC. d/b/a ELCO
LIGHTING, a California Corporation;
ELCO LIGHTING, INC., a California
corporation;

Defendants.

Case No. 2:18-cv-007090-CAS-GJS

**JOINT REPORT SETTING FORTH
CAUSES OF ACTIONS AND
DEFENSES/COUNTERCLAIMS TO
BE PRESENTED AT TRIAL**

Pursuant to the Court's Order (Dkt 555) and direction at the February 22, 2021 oral argument on Plaintiff DMF, Inc.'s ("DMF") Motion to Enforce IPR Estoppel, DMF and Defendants AMP Plus, Inc. dba ELCO Lighting and ELCO Lighting, Inc. ("ELCO") submit the following concerning issues remaining for trial.

The parties have tentatively agreed to dismiss DMF's federal and state trademark and unfair competition claims without prejudice. Upon dismissal, ELCO's unclean hands and non-infringement defenses to those claims will be moot. The parties intend to submit a stipulation and proposed order shortly, which will leave for trial only DMF's patent infringement cause of action and ELCO's defenses and counterclaims thereto as identified by the parties below.

DMF's Statement

The following is a list of the causes of action DMF intends to assert at trial:

1. Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 9,964,266 ("the '266 Patent") by ELCO's Version 1, Version 2 and Version 3 ELL products of the following asserted patent claims:

- Independent Claim 1 and its dependent Claims 2, 4-8 and 13-16
- Independent Claim 17 and its dependent Claims 19 and 21
- Independent Claim 22 and its dependent Claim 25
- Independent Claim 26 and its dependent Claims 28-30

a. Direct infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a)

- DMF established on summary judgment direct infringement of Claims 17, 19, 21, 22, 26 and 28-30, so the trial will not include the issue of whether those claims are infringed. *See* SJ Ruling (Dkt 499)
- DMF established on summary judgment that all limitations of Claim 1 and its dependent Claims 2, 4-8 and 13-16 were met except certain *coupled to* limitations in Claim 1, so only

those *coupled to* limitations remain for trial. *See* Rule 56(g) Order (Dkt 536).

- Infringement of Claim 25 remains for trial.¹

b. Induced and contributory infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) and (c), respectively.

c. Damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284

d. Willful infringement and enhanced damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284

e. Permanent injunction (a preliminary injunction remains in effect)

2. Trademark infringement of DMF's registered One Marks ("ONELED" and "ONEFRAME") and unfair competition under 15 U.S.C. §§ 1114 and 1125(a).

3. Trademark infringement of DMF's One Marks under California common law.

4. Violation of California Business & Professions Code § 17200 and common law unfair competition.

¹ Through an oversight in the summary judgment papers, DMF did not identify Claim 25 in the notice of motion even though Claim 25 was addressed by the parties in DMF's statement of undisputed facts and ELCO's responsive statement of disputed facts (SDF Dkt 366-2 at 46). ELCO's summary judgment SDF ¶¶76-78 (Dkt 366-2 at 46) did not dispute that Claim 25 limitations were met, except whether the accused Version 3 products met the limitation "the sidewall has a first dimension between the closed rear face and the open front face of less than 2 inches" for the same reason ELCO disputed that limitation in Claim 1, i.e., arguing there was an intervening "angled wall." The Court's summary judgment Order (Dkt 499 at 11-13) resolved that dispute in DMF's favor and held that this limitation was met in Claim 1. DMF may seek guidance from the Court regarding how to address this issue.

1 **ELCO's Statement**

2 The following is a list of the affirmative defenses and counterclaims that
3 ELCO intends to present at trial:

- 4 a. Non-infringement of claims 1, 2, 4-8, 13-16, and 25 of the '266 Patent
5 (Defense and Counterclaim);
- 6 b. Invalidity Ground 1 of Claim 17 of the '266 Patent (35 U.S.C. § 102)²
7 (Defense and Counterclaim);
- 8 c. Invalidity Grounds 3, 6, and 10 of all asserted claims of the '266
9 Patent (35 U.S.C. § 103) (Defenses and Counterclaims);
- 10 d. Failure to mark defense (35 U.S.C. § 287(b)(2));
- 11 e. Unclean hands defense as to the ONEFRAME and ONELED federal
12 and state trademark infringement and unfair competition claims;
- 13 f. Non-infringement of the ONEFRAME and ONELED trademarks and
14 Unfair Competition (15 U.S.C. § 1114 and 1125(a)) (Defenses and
15 Counterclaims);
- 16 g. Non-infringement of the ONEFRAME and ONELED trademarks
17 under California Common Law (Defenses and Counterclaims);
- 18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 ² To the extent that the Court does not apply the PTAB finding of invalidity of Claim 17
28 3

1 h. No willful infringement to support enhanced damages (35 U.S.C. §
2 284).

3 DATED: May 19, 2021

BUCHALTER
A Professional Corporation

By: /s/ Roger L. Scott

BUCHALTER
A Professional Corporation
J. Rick Taché
Kari L. Barnes
Roger L. Scott

Attorneys for Defendants
AMP Plus, Inc. doing business as ELCO
Lighting and ELCO Lighting, Inc.

12 DATED: May 19, 2021

DAVIDSON LAW GROUP

By: /s/ Ben M. Davidson
Ben M. Davidson

Attorneys for Plaintiff
DMF, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

/s/ Roger L. Scott
Roger L. Scott